

THE CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM

Report of the 2004 City of Detroit Annual Public Budget Meetings and Citizen Survey



highlighting the Fire, Health and Wellness Promotion, Police,
Public Lighting, Public Works and Recreation Departments

2004 Meeting Sites:

Fifth Police Precinct, 11411 E. Jefferson
Thursday October 14, 6–8 pm

EMS Training Academy, 900 Merrill Plaisance Drive
Tuesday October 19, 6–8 pm

Survey of Citizen Priorities:

available at the meetings, at selected High Schools,
by mail, and at www.ci.detroit.mi.us



Kwame M. Kilpatrick, Mayor
Detroit City Council



THE CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM

The 2004 Annual Public Budget Meetings and Citizen Survey



Table of Contents

What the Citizen Budget Program Does	2
The Meetings, Survey and Packets	3
What Citizens Told Us: The Findings	4
➤ Who participated?	5
➤ What are the most important responsibilities of City government?	7
Overall Purposes or Categories of City Services ...	8
Citizens Understanding of the Annual operating and Capital Budget Making Processes ...	10
➤ What major department services are most important to citizens?	11
➤ How would citizens spend limited City tax money?	22
How The City Will Use The Findings	23
Appendix: Citizen Budget Program Management and Detailed Survey Methods	25

Report contributors: Janet Anderson PhD, Budget Manager II – study methodology, interpretation, writing, editing; Fred Jakubus, Budget Manager – data; Anne Sanocki, ITS Programmer – web survey form and database design; Peter Tate, Planning & Analysis Division, Henry Ford Health Systems – electronic polling data capture; Kwabema Shabu, Communications and Creative Service Department Photographer

THE CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM: The City of Detroit Annual Public Budget Meetings and Citizen Survey



The Annual Public Budget Meetings requirement was added to the Detroit City Charter in 1996. The spirit of this requirement is increased communication with the public about scarce City resources. The Budget Department created the Citizen Budget Program to do this, and Budget staff organize the meetings every October and put out a companion *Survey of Citizen City Service Priorities* from September 1–November 1 each year.

One public meeting is held on the eastside and one is on the westside, with different community partners as hosts. Budget staff meet with high school classes and distribute the Survey with return postage prepaid to block clubs and community organizations and through city facilities. The survey can also be completed on the city website. Everyone is encouraged to participate.

The 2004 meetings were held at the 5th Police Precinct (below) and the EMS Training Academy (right).



WHAT THE CITIZEN BUDGET PROGRAM DOES

The Citizen Budget Program aims for a dialogue with the community: framing the issues around the most important city services so that citizens can weigh in and be heard. For all the tough budget decisions, we want to be consistent with sentiments of the public.

Educational Goal



It's not always easy to figure out who does what in City government, and how decisions are made. We publicize major city services and the process for making budget decisions about them with displays and informational materials at the meetings. An Informational Packet provides contact numbers, and the budget decision deadlines, so that the public can get involved. The Detroit Cable Commission films the meetings to air on Government Access Channel 10 in the Fall.

Your Input

We try to get a variety of citizens from all parts of Detroit to participate. We reach out through community organizations, through libraries, recreation centers and other city facilities, and through the newspapers and radio. Budget Department staff go to Detroit schools to hear from High School students. Everyone can be heard whether or not they come to the meetings, by completing the Citizen Survey between September 1 and November 1 every year and sending it to the City of Detroit Budget Department.



THE MEETINGS, SURVEY AND PACKETS

Citizens are asked to focus on three questions:

1. What are the most important responsibilities of City government?
2. Three-fifths of all tax money is spent on the Fire, Health and Wellness Promotion, Police, Public Lighting, Public Works and Recreation Departments – which of their services or programs should get the most attention?
3. Should they get more attention at the expense of activities in 29 other agencies?

Feedback collected at the meetings, through the internet or mail, and in high schools was sorted according to basic demographics of participants to understand opinions.

The meetings followed the survey: representatives of each major Department talked about their responsibilities. The Budget Director talked about the city's budget. With the assistance of the Henry Ford Health System, citizens used handheld voting devices after each presenter. After the presentations, we heard from citizens about their neighborhoods, their hopes and their expectations of City leaders. This way, everyone's opinions were recorded. We reduced the number of questions at the meetings.

Information Packets were distributed along with the survey, to detail city services and the annual budget in support of people's questions.

*Thank you to the 353 citizens who
participated in 2004*

42 who attended the meetings

83 through the Survey Mailer

143 through the City's Website

85 High School Students and their Teachers

Redford (40)

Kettering (45)

WHAT CITIZENS TOLD US: THE FINDINGS

The 2004 Citizen Budget program involved fewer participants than the prior 2 years, but still involved a range of Detroiters speaking on a number of important questions. 2004 findings are very consistent with prior year findings.

We asked questions that we consider every year in the budget development process:

- **What are the most important functions of City Government?**

The City takes responsibility for a wide range of functions. Public safety is clearly most important to citizens. Likewise, the condition of the physical environment is of ongoing concern. Citizens do not report good understanding of the annual operating and capital budget making processes, but they know that they want the City to focus resources more. And they want to know that city services in their neighborhood are equal to those in other parts of town.

- **What services are most important to you?**

The six major departments highlighted in this process receive three-fifths of all tax money. When citizens looked at all of these responsibilities, clear priorities emerged, including a few programs seen as expendable. Athletic leagues, birth and death records, street cleaning and streets and traffic design, received the lowest budget allocations from citizens.

Citizens are dissatisfied with the precinct response, dumpsite cleanup and street lighting services. Garbage pickup continues to receive high ratings. Youth diverge from adults, showing more concerns for pedestrian-oriented services. Participants of all ages reported that they “Don’t Know” a number of city services in each of the major departments.

- **How would you spend limited City tax money?**

Citizens would focus more of the city’s limited resources on these six major departments – but not necessarily or equally on each. Citizens want to believe that maximum efficiencies are realized. For example, despite highest support for the public safety function, citizens were again willing to cut the Police budget. Despite continued concerns for the physical environment, citizens cut the Public Works budget.

Citizens said that the City has to change the way it does business, to reorganize and take different approaches to service delivery. We learned that there are a number of major city services that people do not understand, and that we need to better communicate what we do. Likewise, citizens want the opportunity for input into policy and management issues.

Who participated?

The meetings draw primarily from surrounding areas, but residents throughout Detroit participate through the mail or the City of Detroit website. Youth meetings at City schools consist of sophomore, junior or senior grade students in any discipline. Four out of five students report an 'A' or 'B' grade point average.

Who Participated: "Demographics" section	At the Meetings (42)	By Mail or Web (226)	Students (85)	All Groups (353)	City in 2000
HOUSEHOLDS:					
% under \$25,000 annual income	24%	19%	<i>n/a</i>	20%	44%
% \$25,000-\$49,999	24%	27%	<i>n/a</i>	26%	28%
% over \$50,000	52%	54%	<i>n/a</i>	54%	28%
% home ownership	85%	77.8%	<i>n/a</i>	79%	55%
Average household size	2.4	2.5	4.5	2.9	2.8
One-person households	35%	26%	0%	27%	30%
INDIVIDUALS:					
% "not presently employed"	0%	7%	<i>n/a</i>	6%	9%
% under 18 years	0%	2%	99%	23.5%	31%
% between 18-24 years	0%	6.4%	1%	5%	10%
% between 25-54 years	31%	62.3%	0%	45%	42%
% over 54 years	69%	29.4%	0%	26.4%	18%

note: students did not report on income, home ownership or employment status.

34 of Detroit's 36 residential zip codes participated in this program in 2004. Youth participants were from 15 zip codes. 50% of adult survey participants were from 8 of areas nearest the two meeting sites:

48205 – 6.7%	48219 – 4.3%	48234 – 4.7%
48207 – 3.7%	48221 – 6.2%	48235 – 4.7%
48214 – 12.1%	48224 – 8.2%	

Our participants reported higher incomes and homeownership than citywide averages. Employment rates and household sizes of adult participants are similar to city averages, but youth households are larger. The overall age mix skews slightly older than in the city as a whole.

30% of City households consist of people living alone. Outside of student households, about one in four participants in this study were in one-person households.

We do not know how many Detroiters belong to the thousands of block clubs and community organizations in the City, but over half of our respondents said they were members. This is consistent with prior years as well. Students were half as likely to report that their families were members of these neighborhood organizations.

The differences between website and mailed or in-person surveys, if any, are not well understood. With smaller meeting turnouts in 2004, it is not clear if prior year tendencies for web users to have higher incomes and homeownership rates have in fact reversed.

The surveys and meetings each had three budget sections and an open comment section. One-third of the surveys included comments about citizens' neighborhoods. Youth were slightly less likely to offer comments, possibly because they completed surveys in one-hour sessions, rather than the two-hour meeting session time.



The meetings traditionally draw a cross-section of the neighborhoods in which they were held, such as this 2003 meeting at Holy Redeemer. Photo: Cordell Stubbs.

What are the most important responsibilities of City government?

There are 8 overall purposes, or functions, of City government activities. Every program currently in the City's budget falls into one of these categories. Not all are completely funded by tax money. What should be the City's responsibility? Of City responsibilities, what should the City emphasize?

How to Stabilize the Tax Base:

"The property taxes are ridiculously too high. This is a beautiful neighborhood, however is going to decline. Several properties are vacant after realizing what the taxes are after the change in ownership."

2004 web survey from 48235 area

Every year, people comment that the City should give up some of its responsibilities: public lighting; some health programs; or activities outside of city limits such as the Detroit Zoo. Many comments relate to selling off assets, including valuable real estate outside of the city or with development potential. There are also suggestions about reducing the tax burden.

Who Gets What? Citizens wonder.

"The city needs to focus on retaining professional tax paying citizens. It seems that our concerns are being completely ignored."

2004 mailed survey from 48214 area

"Ordinances and rules need to be enforced...this is enforced in 'better' parts of the City but not everywhere."

2003 Citizen in 48226 area

"Funds for the Mayor and Governor should be cut. Especially, the funds for the police because they stay out of really troubled areas which need the most assistance."

Renaissance High Student, 2003

"Every other week somewhere on Gratiot the lights are out. But whenever I travel to the westside, I notice the main streets over there the lights are on."

2004 mailed survey from 48205 area

Overall Purposes or Categories of City Services

Citizens ranked the importance of each of these service categories, from 1 – 8. When the same ranking was given to two or more categories, we “weighted” it to get a truer idea of what purposes are truly most or least important to people. For example, two categories each given a #1 rank split the first and second place rank, and were a 1.5.

The average of the rankings and the number of true “1” rankings reflect priorities.

Priority Order of the Categories of the City's Functions: Average of 1 – 8 rank (“True” #1 Ranks received as % All)			
Meeting	Mail / Web	Youth	Overall
Public Safety 43%	Public Safety 2.1 (54%)	Public Safety 3.5 (23%)	1. <i>Public Safety</i>
Physical Environment 14%	Physical Environm't 3.4 (9.7%)	Public Health 3.5 (14.5%)	2. <i>Physical Environment</i>
Mass Transit 11%	Public Health 4.3 (6%)	Mass Transit 4.2 (13%)	3. <i>Public Health</i>
Public Health 7%	Mass Transit 4.5 (3.7%)	Economic Capacity 4.7 (10%)	4. <i>Mass Transportation</i>
Recreation / Culture 7%	Economic Capacity 5.3 (6.5%)	Physical Environm't 4.7 (4.3%)	5 (tie) <i>Economic Capacity</i>
Building Supply 7%	Recreation / Culture 5.3 (0%)	Building Supply 5.0 (8.7%)	5 (tie) <i>Building Supply</i>
Management 7%	Building Supply 5.4 (5%)	Management 5.1 (7%)	5 (tie) <i>Management</i>
Economic Capacity 4%	Management 5.5 (8.6%)	Recreation / Culture 5.1 (4.3%)	5 (tie) <i>Recreation / Culture</i>

*Note: meeting participants did not rank all 8 categories, only their Top 3 priorities
% do not add to 100% because many ranks were not unique, so they were weighted*

Public Safety was the clear winner among the categories. There were some subtle differences among the survey groups, but Public Health, Physical Environment and Mass Transit categories were clearly higher priorities than the remaining categories. Recreation and Culture and Management were each low priority categories.

1. *Public Safety (Police, Fire, EMS)*. Clearly the single highest priority for all groups except youth, who rated public health similarly high.

2. *Physical Environment (solid waste, streetlights, landscaping, water/sewerage)*. High rankings received, including many true #1 rankings from mail and web participants.
3. *Public Health (Health centers, inspections and programs)*. Always receives high rankings and few low rankings.
4. *Mass Transportation (bus services, street maintenance, City Airport, parking structures)*. Comments suggest that bus services drive these rankings, particularly the strong support from youth.
- 5-8 *Economic Capacity (convention center, development assistance, job training)*. Received the fewest #1 rankings at the meetings, but much more support from all other participants.

Building Supply/Conditions (building code enforcement, redevelopment). Low rankings on average despite support from youth.

Recreation and Culture (parks, recreation, cultural institutions, libraries, Cable Channel 10, public relations; not public schools). Received the fewest #1 rankings.

Management (financial, legal, human resources, City Council, Mayor, other line items). Received the third most #1 rankings from web and mail participants, but much less support otherwise.

"This city is top heavy with agencies and staff. They need to combine some agencies and reduce staff. We also need to cut the number of city council to reflect reduced population."

2004 mailed survey from 48217 area

"This city has way too much overhead for a city ... it is a carryover from our days of twice the number of people. Downsize city employees and pay attention to basics..."

2004 web survey from 48202 area

Citizens' Understanding of the Annual Operating and Capital Budget Making Processes

The Annual Public Budget Meetings and citizen survey are the first step of the City's annual budget development process. Citizens were asked how well they understood city budgeting processes.

At the meetings, one in three said that they did not understand the operating budget at all, and two in five said they didn't understand the capital budget process. For each of these processes, one in three mail and web respondents did not understand them.

Across the board, nearly half understood the operating budget "rather well" or "completely"; slightly less for the capital budget. This included nearly one in five youth.

Process of allocating resources:

"We built these casinos to help build the tax base, but I do not see any fruit from this venture."

2003 web Survey

"Still looking for legislation that would appropriate some monies from property taxes on a neighborhood basis..."

2003 web Survey

"How is the City going to preserve services with the proposed elimination of 1,500 to 2,000 positions?"

2004 web survey from 48228 area

Citizens often comment that the survey exercise is an insight for them into the difficulties of budget decisions. Citizens say that city government is inaccessible because they don't have information about who delivers services, and what they are.

Many citizens do not know the limit of city of Detroit authority, for example concerning the Detroit Public Schools, freeway maintenance, or health care provision. With bond authorization proposed on the ballot in a difficult budget year, citizens asked for an explanation of the city's outlook for selling bonds.

Every year, the Budget Department makes available full details of the Mayor's Executive Budget proposals and the final adopted fiscal year Budget on the City of Detroit website (www.ci.detroit.mi.us).

What major department services are most important to citizens?

We asked citizens to do two things for each of the 6 major Departments:

1. Tell us how SATISFIED they are in their neighborhoods with the services they know. On the surveys, a '1' rank was "very satisfied" and a '5' rank was "unacceptable." Or, citizens were invited to indicate "don't know" by any given item. At the meetings, citizens were polled as to the least satisfactory service of each department.
2. On the survey, create "YOUR Budget" for the coming year by dividing \$10 among the programs of each major department; at the meetings, identify the "most important" and "least important" of each major Department's programs.

We also compiled citizen comments about the quality of services in citizen neighborhoods, according to categories of frequency.

Youth tended to give higher satisfaction ratings than adults. This could reflect either their lack of expectations, less experience with services, or in some cases, a more direct experience of some services than adults have. Most service ratings tend toward the middle (3.0) on this 1 – 5 scale, so a rating farther from the 3.0 – either greater or lesser – reflects clearer, more distinct public opinion.

Meeting opinion tends to reflect the neighborhoods surrounding the sites. Youth comments reflect different concerns than adult comments reflect. For example, youth are preoccupied with their experience as pedestrians, whereas adults were most concerned about reorganizing or re-engineering city government.

Many services of concern to citizens fall outside of the responsibilities of the six major city departments. These include responsibilities of property maintenance and demolition (Buildings and Safety Engineering Department); vacant land sale and redevelopment (Planning and Development Department); solid waste code enforcement (Department of Environmental Affairs); and public transit (Department of Transportation).

Citizen comments emphasized focusing limited resources on the visible field services that are fundamental to quality of life in Detroit. Improving the efficiency of our processes and increasing our partnerships with the community are two examples. In 2002, one in ten comments were about these management methods; in 2003 and 2004, nearly one in six adults who made comments touched on this broad issue.

The Fire Department

Adults and youth alike were relatively satisfied with the mix of services offered by the Fire Department. Likewise, with the performance of these services.

Fire suppression and emergency medical services are the clearest priorities, though less strong for youth. Few people gave \$0 to these or any Fire Department services.

Citizen Satisfaction and Budget Priorities for Fire Department services						
SURVEY		MTGS	SERVICE	SURVEY		MTGS
Avg Ranking (1 – 5)		% least		“Your Budget”		Highest
Adults	Youth	satisfied		Adults	Youth	priority
2.5	2.0	7%	Fire suppression (fighters/equipment)	\$3.01	\$2.26	37%
2.7	2.4	14.3%	Fire prevention	\$1.77	\$1.78	23%
3.0	2.6	18%	Arson investigation	\$1.43	\$1.76	3%
2.9	2.5	28.6%	EMS emergency medical service	\$2.49	\$2.34	34%
2.9	2.3	18%	Hazardous materials response	\$1.29	\$1.85	3%
				\$10.00	\$10.00	
‘1’ very satisfied; ‘5’ unacceptable						

Many people don't know about arson investigation or the emergency preparedness function of responding to hazardous materials. Few citizens commented about Fire Department services.

The Fire Commissioner talked about the proposed bond authorization, which would support a training campus in addition to renovation and new construction of stations.



Citizen Knowledge of Fire Services: % “Don’t Know” for each service			
	Meeting	Web/Mail	Youth
Fire suppression	14%	13%	8%
Fire prevention	14%	14%	10%
Arson investigation	14%	27.4%	19.7%
EMS emergency medical svc	14%	14%	8%
Hazardous materials response	14%	28.7%	25.4%

Note: meeting participants were asked with which services they were least satisfied, and indicated “don’t know” generally about all that department’s services.

The Police Department

The most important responsibility of Police, by all accounts, is its visible presence in our communities. Citizens want to see them, to communicate what they see to them, and to have them respond to their requests.

Precinct response is the consensus priority of the Police Department. Adults placed second highest priority on narcotics enforcement. As with City codes in general, citizens comment that they want stricter enforcement of laws.

Respondents were not satisfied with the precinct response time or crime prevention, and adults were not satisfied with narcotics enforcement services. The best ranking given was to partnerships with the community.

Citizen Satisfaction and Budget Priorities for Police Department services						
SURVEY		MTGS	SERVICE	SURVEY		MTGS
Avg Ranking (1 – 5)		% least satisfied		“Your Budget”		Highest priority
Adults	Youth			Adults	Youth	
3.6	3.3	40%	Precinct response to calls	\$2.72	\$2.49	46%
3.8	3.4	17%	Crime prevention	\$1.24	\$1.67	27%
3.7	3.0	23%	Narcotics enforcement	\$1.94	\$1.37	11.6%
3.1	3.3	13%	Partnerships with the community	\$1.20	\$1.27	15.4%
3.6	2.8	7%	Victim assistance	\$1.16	\$1.73	0%
3.4	2.7	0%	Traffic enforcement	\$1.73	\$1.45	0%
				\$10.00	\$10.00	
‘1’ very satisfied; ‘5’ unacceptable						

Citizen Knowledge of Police Services: % “Don’t Know” for each service			
	Meeting	Adults	Youth
Precinct response to calls	0%	5%	5%
Crime prevention	0%	5.6%	1.6%
Narcotics enforcement	0%	7.3%	6.3%
Partnerships with the community	0%	4.5%	11.3%
Victim assistance	0%	16.6%	3%
Traffic enforcement	0%	3.4%	0%

Note: meeting participants were asked with which services they were least satisfied, and indicated “don’t know” generally about all that department’s services.

The highest percentage of adults reported they “don’t know” about victim assistance, while the highest percentage of youth don’t know about community partnerships.

Overall, partnerships with the community received the greatest number of \$0 allocations of Police services – nearly one in ten participants eliminated that item from their budgets.



A citizen asked “Why does the consent decree cost so much money, and how do we prevent (the problem) from happening again?” Deputy Chief Brenda Andrews explained that it funds training and new facilities, which promise to keep the city in compliance for a long time.

The Public Lighting Department

Residential street lighting is far and away the most important of PLD's programs to citizens. Adults told us in their satisfaction ratings and survey comments that they were not satisfied with the reliability of street lighting in their neighborhoods. Main street lighting received even worse rankings. Youth were less critical in their assessments.

Youth continue to comment about the importance of lighting to their sense of safety.

Citizen Satisfaction and Budget Priorities for Public Lighting Department services						
SURVEY		MTGS	SERVICE	SURVEY		MTGS
Avg Ranking (1 – 5)		% least		“Your Budget”		Highest
Adults	Youth	satisfied		Adults	Youth	priority
3.7	2.5	32%	Main Street Lighting	\$2.88	\$2.58	28%
3.4	2.6	57%	Residential Street Lighting	\$3.87	\$3.19	59%
3.1	2.6	4%	Electric power production	\$1.85	\$2.38	10%
3.0	2.5	0%	Steam or electricity for some buildings	\$1.39	\$1.83	3%
				\$10.00	\$10.00	
‘1’ very satisfied; ‘5’ unacceptable						

Many people don't understand PLD's power production and steam and electricity distribution operations. Citizens consistently comment that these are businesses the City might look at getting out of, and one in eight adults eliminated these items from their budgets for PLD.

Citizen Knowledge of PLD Services: % "Don't Know" for each service			
	Meeting	Web/Mail	Youth
Main Street Lighting	7%	0%	4.6%
Residential Street Lighting	7%	1.7%	3%
Electric power production	7%	29.6%	14.5%
Steam/electricity for some buildings	7%	18.5%	14.3%

Note: meeting participants were asked with which services they were least satisfied, and indicated "don't know" generally about all that department's services.

The Department of Public Works

Garbage pickup continues to be a success story for the City. Citizens appreciate the timeliness and reliability of the service. This was true in all areas of the city, and according to all survey groups. Few city services rated as highly this year, although satisfaction ratings were even higher in every prior year.

Bulk pickup is another matter. Citizens told us they wanted those who set out bulk items at incorrect times to be punished.

Participants overall gave the highest budget allocations to garbage pickup. Dumpsite and vacant lot cleanup receives high allocations as well, and only a few \$0 allocations.

Conversely, street cleaning and streets and traffic design received the lowest allocations. One in eight eliminated streets and traffic design from their budgets, and one in thirteen eliminated funding for street cleaning.

Citizen Satisfaction and Budget Priorities for DPW Department services						
SURVEY		MTGS	SERVICE	SURVEY		MTGS
Avg Ranking (1 – 5)		% least		“Your Budget”		Highest
Adults	Youth	satisfied		Adults	Youth	priority
2.4	2.5	0%	Garbage pickup / waste disposal	\$2.42	\$2.10	16.7%
3.8	3.6	50%	Dumping and vacant lot cleanup	\$1.96	\$1.83	43.3%
3.8	3.3	28.6%	Maintenance of City-owned streets	\$1.82	\$1.35	26.7%
3.5	2.6	10.7%	Snow and ice removal	\$1.64	\$1.81	13.3%
3.3	2.9	3.6%	Street cleaning	\$1.13	\$1.53	0%
3.3	3.1	3.6%	Streets and traffic systems design	\$1.02	\$1.36	0%
				\$10.00	\$10.00	
‘1’ very satisfied; ‘5’ unacceptable						

Everyone is concerned about vacant land in the City. So many city services are connected to this problem. Dumpsite and vacant lot cleanup services were the lowest rated of any item by youth as well as adults, and were the highest priority in many budgets. People consistently ask for more aggressive demolition (a Buildings and Safety Engineering Department responsibility). There were again a lot of comments about enforcement of property maintenance standards (also a BSE responsibility), including on city-owned vacant lots.

Another area of concern is the condition of roads. While many people may not know which roads are the city's responsibility to maintain, citizens throughout Detroit told us that there needs to be more maintenance.

Of all youth concerns, the most common related to the physical environment of their neighborhoods: unkempt and abandoned buildings, vacant land, litter in the streets, the lack of facilities.

Youth are also very sensitive to issues that might be called pedestrian-oriented, such as timeliness of snow and ice removal, sidewalk repair, weed overgrowth on vacant lots, the condition of roads, and traffic enforcement.

Citizens continue to be concerned about enforcement of ordinances related to littering and dumping. DPW Director James Jackson explained that these offenders will be prosecuted starting in January 2005 at the city's new Department of Administrative Hearings.

Citizen Knowledge of DPW Services: % "Don't Know" for each service			
	Meeting	Web/Mail	Youth
Garbage pickup / waste disposal	4%	1.1%	3%
Dumping and vacant lot cleanup	4%	2.2%	5%
Maintenance of City-owned streets	4%	1.7%	6.6%
Snow and ice removal	4%	1.1%	3%
Street cleaning	4%	1.1%	3%
Streets and traffic systems design	4%	8.2%	10%

Note: meeting participants were asked with which services they were least satisfied, and indicated "don't know" generally about all that department's services.

The Department of Health and Wellness Promotion

The Department of Health and Wellness Promotion administers a variety of programs, and those who understood this mix were somewhat satisfied with it. Performance of most services rated adequately, except for rodent control and restaurant inspections, and substance abuse prevention and treatment.

Many people told us that they don't know about the department's services, other than animal control. This may be, at least in part, because so many are targeted services. All other department services had much lower rates of "don't know".

The most important Department responsibilities indicated in this survey are communicable disease prevention and substance abuse prevention and treatment. Birth and death and other information received the greatest number of \$0 allocations (one in ten), followed by primary care and dental services.

At the meetings and in the web and mailed surveys, a number of the health service concerns were related to student access, particularly making educational information available in the schools.

Citizen Satisfaction and Budget Priorities for Health and Wellness Department services						
SURVEY		MTGS	SERVICE	SURVEY		MTGS
Avg Ranking (1 – 5)		% least		“Your Budget”		Highest
Adults	Youth	satisfied		Adults	Youth	priority
3.2	3.1	21.4%	Animal Control	\$1.19	\$1.29	3%
2.5	2.5	0%	Birth records, death certif., other info	\$0.84	\$1.31	3%
3.0	2.4	14.3%	Communicable disease prevention	\$1.45	\$1.33	6.5%
3.6	2.9	18%	Rodents, restaurant inspections	\$1.37	\$1.24	13%
3.4	2.3	21.4%	Primary care clinics, dental services	\$1.21	\$1.12	32%
3.3	3.0	7%	School health services	\$1.26	\$1.06	22.5%
2.9	2.3	0%	Pregnant women & children services	\$1.21	\$1.20	10%
3.5	2.8	7%	Subst. abuse prevention & treatment	\$1.46	\$1.45	10%
				\$10.00	\$10.00	
‘1’ very satisfied; ‘5’ unacceptable						

Citizen Knowledge of Health and Wellness Promotion Services: % “Don’t Know” for each service			
	Meeting	Web/Mail	Youth
Animal Control	10.7%	12.9%	8%
Birth records and Death certificates	10.7%	22%	20.6%
Communicable disease prevention	10.7%	24.7%	16%
Rodents, restaurant inspections	10.7%	24.6%	16.4%
Primary care clinics, dental services	10.7%	29.6%	11.7%
School health services	10.7%	27%	13%
Pregnant women & children services	10.7%	27.8%	17.7%
Substance abuse prevention & treatment	10.7%	25.7%	18%

Note: meeting participants were asked with which services they were least satisfied, and indicated “don’t know” generally about all that department’s services.



Dr. Noble Maseru became the Department Director at the beginning of 2003, and increased the focus more on prevention leading to the change in the Department's name.

The Recreation Department

Especially for recreation department services, youth had very different opinions than adults. Youth satisfaction for all recreation services was much greater than adult satisfaction ratings for recreation.

After school programs were close to the highest priority of survey respondents taken as a whole. Some citizens made a point to distinguish between after school programs and other recreation programs offered. Youth placed after-school programs above other recreation department programs in their budgets.

Citizen Satisfaction and Budget Priorities for Recreation Department services						
SURVEY		MTGS	SERVICE	SURVEY		MTGS
Avg Ranking (1 – 5)		% least		“Your Budget”		Highest
Adults	Youth	satisfied		Adults	Youth	priority
3.2	2.6	12.5%	Belle Isle and Riverfront parks	\$1.81	\$1.15	16.5%
3.4	2.4	25%	After-school programs	\$1.58	\$1.45	28%
3.3	2.2	0%	Recreation programs	\$1.54	\$1.76	28%
3.6	3.0	6.3%	Playground maintenance, activities	\$1.49	\$1.51	0%
3.5	2.9	12.5%	Landscape of parks and trees	\$1.36	\$1.50	11%
3.6	2.4	31%	Recreation center/equipment mtc	\$1.25	\$1.23	16.5%
3.2	2.2	0%	Athletic leagues/competitions	\$0.96	\$1.40	0%
				\$10.00	\$10.00	
‘1’ very satisfied; ‘5’ unacceptable						

The Belle Isle and Riverfront parks service received the highest budgets and the fewest \$0 allocations from adults, but was the lowest priority for youth in 2004. Athletic leagues and competition received the least support from adults both in terms of the lowest budget allocations and the most \$0 allocations (one in six of those surveyed).

Landscaping of parks and trees has received improved ratings in 2003 and 2004, but still is receiving relatively low satisfaction ratings. Playground and recreation center maintenance received the lowest satisfaction ratings this year, along with after-school programs.



Recreation Department Deputy Director Lee Stephenson personally addresses a citizen concern after the Farwell meeting in 2003.

In 2004, fewer youth than in prior years made comments about recreation programs and serviceable playground or recreation center facilities in their neighborhoods.

Citizen Knowledge of Recreation Services: % "Don't Know" for each service			
	Meeting	Web/Mail	Youth
Belle Isle and Riverfront parks	12.5%	3.8%	5%
After-school programs	12.5%	20.3%	1.7%
Recreation programs	12.5%	17.7%	3.4%
Playground maintenance, activities	12.5%	11.1%	3%
Landscape of parks and trees	12.5%	7.3%	6.8%
Recreation center/equipment maintenance	12.5%	18.2%	11.7%
Athletic leagues/competitions	12.5%	23.3%	8.5%

Note: meeting participants were asked with which services they were least satisfied, and indicated "don't know" generally about all that department's services.

How would citizens spend limited City tax money?

We asked “How much money would you give to each department,” and “which departments would you increase or decrease?” We wanted to know how the current budget for each major department, for the 7 staff agencies, and for 29 other tax-supported agencies, might be changed. Which departments should get more attention, and at the expense of which other departments funded by City tax money?

Two out of three adult surveys and one in four youth surveys reported on this question.

Consistent with citizen comments about reducing the scope of city government, increases to major government budgets were typically made at the expense of the amount spent on the many internal staff departments and other tax-supported agencies. Among these comments were to stop subsidies, and to reduce the tax burden in Detroit.

At the meetings, where citizens were asked which single department they most wanted to increase, they showed the overwhelming support for the Public Safety function. If permitted to make their own budgets for major departments, citizens were more likely to increase those major departments with the lowest current budget shares: PLD, and Recreation. They were more likely to increase Fire than Health or Police for that matter; but almost three in five were willing to cut Police funding because of its major share.

“Your budget” for Major Department services: % of Citizens increasing (decreasing) each line item				
Department	Current Budget	Mail and Web	Youth	Meetings
Fire	\$12.94	50% (42%)	52% (39%)	0%
Police	29.66	36% (57%)	17.4% (74%)	53%
Public Lighting	3.87	71.5% (10%)	87% (4%)	13%
Public Works	11.00	28.5% (47%)	22% (69.6%)	7%
Recreation	2.94	65% (10%)	74% (13%)	0%
Health & Wellness Promotion	2.62	40% (12.5%)	96% (0%)	17%
Major Departments	\$63.03			
Internal Staff and Other				
Tax-Supported Agencies	\$36.97	5% (81%)	0% (91%)	10%
	\$100			100%
<i>Note: meeting participants were only asked which of the line items they would increase</i>				

HOW THE CITY WILL USE THE FINDINGS

The Budget Department provides this information to Mayor Kilpatrick, to City Council members and to every City Department Director, and will make it broadly available on the City's website and to the requesting public.

By December 8, all City agencies are required to make requests for the budget covering July 1, 2005 – June 30, 2006. The budget process includes a series of reviews of agency proposals, first by the Budget Director, then by the Mayor, then by the City Council. These reviews are based on the actual costs we see in the current year, and on the priorities of City leaders. The Citizen Budget Program allows us to more effectively factor citizen concerns and priorities into these important decisions.

Citizens, business, community organizations and everyone with a stake in Detroit, are encouraged to get involved when City Council opens debate in April and May before making final budget decisions. City Council will set public hearing dates at that time.



APPENDIX: METHODOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT

Managing the Citizen Budget Program

The City Charter requires that a public meeting be held by November 1 each year to review programs, services and activities proposed for the major departments' budgets, and to receive public comment (Section 8-203). The Budget Department takes the lead.

Budget arranges meetings, creates the annual survey, and leads the outreach. (DWSD holds separate public hearings.) The Communications and Creative Service Department helps create materials and makes media contacts. Budget bulk mails community organizations, delivers materials to city facilities, and presents at Community meetings.

Direct expenses for this effort in 2004 were \$3800, same as in 2003. This was primarily for the bulk mailout, and for ads in the Michigan Chronicle and Detroit Legal News (as required by Charter). Two Budget staff work ½ time for two months organizing the events and outreach. Janet Anderson PhD is the Manager and Principle on the study.

History of Public Meeting Outreach and Participation

Meeting Site	Outreach				Participation			
	Mail Units	Flyers to sites / Events	Print Info Packs	Voice ads: radio/tv or meetings	Number Attending Meetings	Meeting Surveys Received	Mailed in/ Internet Surveys	Youth Surveys Received
Northwest Activities Butzel Family Center 1997 Totals	600	500	200	n.a.	90 77 167	61 41 102	n.a.	n.a.
11th Police Precinct LASED Comm. Ctr 1998 Totals	600	1600	200	n.a.	66 44 110	95²	n.a.	141²
9th Police Precinct 6th Police Precinct 1999 Totals¹	600	1500	537	1	55 31 86	65	n.a.	n.a.
Adams-Butzel Center Coleman Young Ctr 2000 Totals	3424	5000	316	n.a.	71 26 97	46	106	n.a.
Dominican High Williams Rec Center 2001 Totals	3517	4150	170	n.a.	47 37 84	35 28 63	218	159
Blight Busters' Center Howe Elementary 2002 Totals¹	3824	11,350	215	7	111 99 210	38 70 108	393	303
Holy Redeemer Farwell Rec Center 2003 Totals	3829	15,500	360	7	88 103 191	87 92 179	341	297
5 th Police Precinct EMS Training Acad. 2004 Totals	3896	6,000	200	4	19 23 42	17 19 36	226	85
Averages					62			
Note 1: Starting in 1999, an announcement booklet was distributed; in 2002, a post card went to each site's Zip+4 (=7553) Note 2: In 1998, youth participated at the 11 th Precinct meeting; starting in 2001, meetings were held in schools								

Further Detail of Survey Methods

Citizens were ranking categories throughout the survey according to what they thought each represented. At the meetings and in the schools, brief presentations were slightly more elaborate of the categories for participants.

A citizen's ranking might reflect his opinion of the importance of the function or service, or it might reflect what he thinks the City of Detroit's role is in providing it. For example, some citizens ranked Public Transportation low and said that the City of Detroit should not be the provider; undoubtedly, this could have been part of other rankings as well.

In survey section II, we asked citizens to tell us how satisfied they are in their neighborhoods with the services they know, using a 1 – 5 rank ("very satisfied" to "unacceptable"). Or, citizens were invited to indicate "don't know" by any given item. This rating scale depends heavily on criteria that are often subjective. For example, a rating of unacceptable might indicate a single bad experience, or it might reflect wide-ranging service level expectations. In addition, they were referencing their own neighborhoods, however they understood that. In sum, these rankings do not explain why a person is dissatisfied; they only raise flags.

We also asked citizens in section II to create "YOUR Budget" for the coming year by dividing \$10 among the programs of each major department; at the meetings, we asked citizens to identify the "most important" of each major Department's programs. The budget allocations are assumed to reflect the order of priority placed on each service. If an item was given the highest amount, it was assumed to be the most important to that individual. It was not assumed that the individual felt it was currently under-resourced, or that the individual perceived that it was a more costly item to accomplish. An item given \$0 was assumed to be one for which the department should not use tax dollars if push came to shove.

Using the data this way, we adjusted budgets for under- or over-allocation. For example, if a citizen balanced to \$8, each item was prorated up by 25% to equal to the \$10 total. In this way, the data was used as shares or percentages and not as dollars. Average budget allocations presented for each item therefore should total nearly \$10, according to rounding practices in weighting.

Rankings in section I were also weighted to take into account "overvoting" or the casting of duplicate votes. For example, if 5 items were given a #1, then these items shared the first 5 places (or a '3' ranking each). Few surveys involved this. Youth surveys did not,

and meeting polling did not permit it. People may have felt they were giving emphasis to items by placing them all as #1, but weighting preserved the real “true” value of a rank.

Section III was intended to measure overall priorities placed on departments. Any item deviating from the provided “Current Budget” share (rounded to the nearest integer) was classified as an “increase” or a “decrease.” Citizen budgets for the tax-supported agencies in Section III were weighted using the same technique used in Section II.

Demographics are essential to interpreting summary findings. Without random and representative sampling methods, statistical methods of relating survey opinion to Detroiters’ opinions were not utilized. While participation is open and somewhat randomly announced, its circumstances – whether or not the act of choosing to participate is diffuse – have not been analyzed. As a consequence, demographics are analyzed in the aggregate relative to citywide characteristics to highlight facets of representation in the study. Likewise, biases introduced by online “web” survey procedures are not well understood.

A Sql Server database was created for automatic capture of the online survey responses, using ASP.NET forms. The survey link was active from September 1, 2004 until November 1, 2004 on the homepage of the city website. (Technical difficulties for the first two weeks in October prevented surveys from being completed or posting.)

The database had the following limitations:

- occasional run-time errors associated with the user interface. These errors may have led to more missing data values.
- inability to restrict calculated field totals to the \$10 and 100% totals prescribed in the “Your Budget” sections.
- inaccurate posting of \$0 allocations to Health Department programs as missing data

Meeting data was accumulated as individuals selected answers. Response rates vary on each question, according to citizen preference or as people register late or take breaks, etc. At the eastside meeting, no polling on Recreation Department questions occurred because the speaker could not be present until late in the session.